

Date: Tue, 12 Jul 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #306
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 12 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 306

Today's Topics:

 Emergency TX on police freq.
 Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 1994 21:46:36 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!csn!joelf@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

John O. Feher (feher@netcom.com) wrote:

: A question to all:
: Suppose a ham radio operator is in a
: life-threatening emergency with a modified radio
: in his hand. Should he attempt to call/break in
: on a public safety (ie police) dispatch freq.

: Would this be legal in case of a true e,mergency?
: Would it work or are such main dispatch frequencies
: "protected" by some squelch system?

I believe that I read a of a case in So. California where this happened,
if memory serve, the guy tried repeaters & cell phones and finally made
the call on public safety freq's. He had his radio (license as well?)
taken away, the justification was that it was not FCC type accepted for
those frequencies.

Joel
KG0IL

Date: 11 Jul 1994 19:52:48 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!kennish@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <071094161410Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> wrote:

>
>Yes they are legal. A repeater can have ancillary functions. All the
>things that we are talking about are ANCILIARY to the normal function of
>the repeater. The PURPOSE of the patch, announcements and reverse patch are
>to provide ancillary functions to the users of the repeater. And use of
>those functions can be restricted by the repeater trustees.

If you are referring to 97.205(e), you forgot one tiny fact. It
is worded: "Ancillary functions of a repeater that are available
to users on the INPUT CHANNEL are not considered..." (emphasis mine).

Unless someone keys the repeater to make the announcement, then
the announcement is a beacon broadcast and thus illegal. Reverse
patches are controlled (and the message that comes from that,
whatever the form) is triggered by a phone line, not the input channel....

Forward patches ARE legal, since they are functions available
on the INPUT channel.

-Ken

Date: Mon, 11 Jul 1994 20:37:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
uhog.mit.edu!news.kei.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <pq9TBp-.edellers@delphi.com>, <Css6zp.A8C@wang.com>,
<071194150301Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>.
Subject : Re: Emergency TX on police freq.

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>What I think (or you, or the ARRL or whoever) is irrelevant. What matters
>is how the FCC will interpret it.

Not true. If I'm in a life-threatening situation (which is, I think,
where this started), what *I* think matters more (at least, to me)
than what a rule book says.

I'd rather lose my ham license than lose my life.

Dave, KZ10

(but I'd rather keep both, thank you)

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Imaging

Date: 11 Jul 1994 20:50:27 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!kennish@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vh9et\$mdb@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>, <2vhki4\$h1n@agate.berkeley.edu>,
<CSLE87-080794072816@145.1.114.19>

Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <CSLE87-080794072816@145.1.114.19>, Karl Beckman <CSLE87> wrote:

>

>Cross-band repeaters aren't illegal per se, but they sure don't utilize any
>form of spectral efficiency which USED to be considered good amateur
>operating practice. However, the USERS who don't listen to the outputs of
>BOTH (or ALL) the linked stations running in repeater mode are absolutely
>responsible for the interference they cause to others already using the
>various frequencies involved.

>

Agreed. But, I would guess that 90+% of the dual-band rigs running as
x-band repeaters are doing so illegally:

1) There is no control link. If you put the mobile in your
car in xband repeat and take your HT down the canyon to go
fishing, there is not control link for you to turn on and off
your mobile in the car. This is illegal. Some rigs now do
have a method of using a DTMF sequence to address this problem.

2) Unless you have an ID'er, you are most likely going to bust
the rules for repeater ID on the path from the xband repeater to
your HT. Remember, you have to ID on both directions.

There are other problems, but these two come to mind.

-Ken

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #306
